

COMPLAINT AND REQUEST FOR INJUNCTION

I. The Parties to This Complaint

A. The Plaintiff(s)

Provide the information below for each plaintiff named in the complaint. Attach additional pages if needed.

Name	Antonio Luis Freire Et al,
Street Address	3890 CAMBRIDGE STREET #308
City and County	City of Las Vegas, County of Clark
State and Zip Code	Nevada [89119]
Telephone Number	(702) 613-8612
E-mail Address	tonyfreire702@gmail.com

B. The Defendant(s)

Provide the information below for each defendant named in the complaint, whether the defendant is an individual, a government agency, an organization, or a corporation. For an individual defendant, include the person's job or title (if known). Attach additional pages if needed.

Defendant No. 1	
Name	LAS VEGAS METRO POLICE DEPARTMENT Et al
Job or Title (if known)	
Street Address	400 MARTIN LUTHER KING BLVD.
City and County	CITY OF LAS VEGAS, COUNTY OF CLARK
State and Zip Code	89106
Telephone Number	(702) 828-3111
E-mail Address (if known)	
Defendant No. 2	
Name	CLARK COUNTY DETENTION CENTER Et al,
Job or Title (if known)	
Street Address	333 CASINO CENTER BLVD.
City and County	CITY OF LAS VEGAS, COUNTY OF CLARK
State and Zip Code	STATE OF NEVADA 89101
Telephone Number	(702) 671-3900
E-mail Address (if known)	
Defendant No. 3	
Name	OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY Et al,
Job or Title (if known)	
Street Address	200 LEWIS AVE.
City and County	CITY OF LAS VEGAS, COUNTY OF CLARK
State and Zip Code	STATE OF NEVADA 89101
Telephone Number	(702) 671-2500
E-mail Address (if known)	
Defendant No. 4	
Name	REGIONAL JUSTICE CENTER Et al,
Job or Title (if known)	
Street Address	200 LEWIS AVE.
City and County	CITY OF LAS VEGAS, COUNTY OF CLARK
State and Zip Code	STATE OF NEVADA 89101
Telephone Number	(702) 455-4528
E-mail Address (if known)	

II.	Basis	Basis for Jurisdiction .				
	heard partic is a fe anoth	Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction (limited power). Generally, only two types of cases can be heard in federal court: cases involving a federal question and cases involving diversity of citizenship of the parties. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, a case arising under the United States Constitution or federal laws or treaties is a federal question case. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1332, a case in which a citizen of one State sues a citizen of another State or nation and the amount at stake is more than \$75,000 is a diversity of citizenship case. In a diversity of citizenship case, no defendant may be a citizen of the same State as any plaintiff.				
	What	is the basis for federal court jurisdiction? (check all that apply) Federal question Diversity of citizenship				
	Fill o	ut the paragraphs in this section that apply to this case.				
	A.	If the Basis for Jurisdiction Is a Federal Question				
		List the specific federal statutes, federal treaties, and/or provisions of the United States Constitution that are at issue in this case. Please see Attachment 1.				

B.

If the Basis for Jurisdiction Is Diversity of Citizenship 1. The Plaintiff(s) If the plaintiff is an individual a. The plaintiff, (name) Antonio Luis Freire Et al, , is a citizen of the State of (name) Territory of California b. If the plaintiff is a corporation , is incorporated The plaintiff, (name) under the laws of the State of (name) and has its principal place of business in the State of (name) (If more than one plaintiff is named in the complaint, attach an additional page providing the same information for each additional plaintiff.) 2. The Defendant(s) If the defendant is an individual a. , is a citizen of The defendant, (name) . Or is a citizen of the State of (name)

(foreign nation)

B.

Ш.

		b. .	If the defendant is a corporation
~			The defendant, (name) LVMPD Et al, ODA Et al, etc. Et al, , is incorporated under
			the laws of the State of (name) NEVADA , and has its
		1	principal place of business in the State of (name) NEVADA .
		•	Or is incorporated under the laws of (foreign nation) ENGLAND (TITLE 8 SEC. 1481)
		ŧ	and has its principal place of business in (name) NEVADA .
			than one defendant is named in the complaint, attach an additional page providing the formation for each additional defendant.)
3. The Amount in Controversy			ount in Controversy
			ount in controversy-the amount the plaintiff claims the defendant owes or the amount at more than \$75,000, not counting interest and costs of court, because (explain):
		both ag office a	e a legally and lawfully binding contract with the LVMPD and ODA which officers from encies have breached. 2) Officers of the RJC and CCDC have breached their oaths of and employment contracts which injured me and left me an aggrieved party. According to Section 3571 the fees for each felony offense is in excess of \$100,000.00 U.S.D.
Write a facts si was in includi	howing to volved as ing the di and write	nd plain s hat each p nd what e ates and p	tatement of the claim. Do not make legal arguments. State as briefly as possible the plaintiff is entitled to the injunction or other relief sought. State how each defendant ach defendant did that caused the plaintiff harm or violated the plaintiff's rights, places of that involvement or conduct. If more than one claim is asserted, number each not plain statement of each claim in a separate paragraph. Attach additional pages if
A.	Where	did the ev	vents giving rise to your claim(s) occur?
	Within	the State	of Nevada, County of Clark.
В.	What d	late and a	pproximate time did the events giving rise to your claim(s) occur?
	establi dates	ishment o of the inju	that there has been multiple violations of a contract which have occurred since the of the contract in October 2013 this is also a R.I.C.O. Act violation. The approximate, iries are: 11/15/2016, 10/20/2014, 07/28/2014 and 06/01/2011. I reserve my right to add n evidentiary hearing.

C. What are the facts underlying your claim(s)? (For example: What happened to you? Who did what? Was anyone else involved? Who else saw what happened?)

I have repeatedly had officers of all 4 agencies (LVMPD, ODA, RJC and CCDC) violate their oaths of office and employment contracts as well as my legally and lawfully binding contract (with the agents of the ODA and LVMPD), in their dealings with me. The facts of this case and the injuries I have sustained at the hands of these 4 agencies are too numerous to list here and so as not to waste the courts valuable and limited resources, I respectfully demand an evidentiary hearing at the earliest possible time to remove any questions that I am an injured and aggrieved party. I have video evidence to support my claim as well as court transcripts which prove that the judges acted on their individual capacity and therefore the officers of the LVMPD and CCDC never had authority to take any actions against me or my person. I never signed my daughters birth certificate and therefore no court ever had any contract obligating me to their jurisdiction to act against me. Without a bonafide warrant all arrests are false.

IV. Irreparable Injury

Explain why monetary damages at a later time would not adequately compensate you for the injuries you sustained, are sustaining, or will sustain as a result of the events described above, or why such compensation could not be measured.

I have lost time with my children. The agencies in question can never give me that time back. I have lost and not been accepted at good paying jobs due to multiple false arrests. I have lost respect of family and friends.

V. Relief

State briefly and precisely what damages or other relief the plaintiff asks the court to order. Do not make legal arguments. Include any basis for claiming that the wrongs alleged are continuing at the present time. Include the amounts of any actual damages claimed for the acts alleged and the basis for these amounts. Include any punitive or exemplary damages claimed, the amounts, and the reasons you claim you are entitled to actual or punitive money damages.

Just enforce the contract I have and give me the monies I am owed as well as assurances that such behavior will not happen again.

VI. Certification and Closing

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, by signing below, I certify to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief that this complaint: (1) is not being presented for an improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation; (2) is supported by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying, or reversing existing law; (3) the factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, will likely have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery; and (4) the complaint otherwise complies with the requirements of Rule 11.

A. For Parties Without an Attorney

I agree to provide the Clerk's Office with any changes to my address where case-related papers may be served. I understand that my failure to keep a current address on file with the Clerk's Office may result in the dismissal of my case.

	Date of signing: Whe 2017
	Signature of Plaintiff Printed Name of Plaintiff Printed Name of Plaintiff
В.	For Attorneys
	Date of signing:
	Signature of Attorney
	Printed Name of Attorney
	Bar Number
	Name of Law Firm
	Street Address
	State and Zip Code
	Telephone Number
	E-mail Address

AFFIDAVIT

- 1) I, Antonio Luis Freire, agent, in my correct public capacity as beneficiary to the Original Jurisdiction, being of majority age, competent to testify, a self-realized and free sentient man upon the land, my yes be yes, my no be no, do state that the truths and facts herein are of firsthand personal knowledge and that they are true, correct, complete, not just true and correct, certain and not misleading.
- 2) Antonio Luis Freire has knowledge of copyright laws, and therefore, Antonio Luis Freire has observed the copyright symbol(s) contained within what appears to be ALL Books, Codes, References, Reporters, and the like dealing with law, and such symbol's use and employment in providing notice that the contents therein are the private property of the copyright owner, and Antonio Luis Freire freely admitting that Antonio Luis Freire has neither grant, franchise, license, NOR letter-patent to use said contents, NOR practice the same. Please be advised that ALL Cites thereto, and excerpts therefrom, are utilized and employed herein merely for educational and communicational purposes, to display from where Antonio Luis Freire present understanding inheres from, and, due to the depth of the matter with which this controversy attempts to cover. This disclaimer shall be in effect for the entirety of these proceedings.
- 3) Antonio Luis Freire is not to be considered a decedent. He has a name and social security number, that number is XXX-XX-XXXX. Antonio Luis Freire (as defined by Nevada Revised Statutes 0.039) is an Authorized Representative for ANTONIO LUIS FREIRE, (a California corporation as defined by Nevada Revised Statutes 205.4611) and is not an attorney so he may be heard by the court in this case, in sworn testimony and through his written word when such is sworn under oath or affirmation.
- 4) Antonio Luis Freire is claiming to be a Pro Se litigant; allegations such as those asserted by petitioner, however inartfully decreed, are sufficient... which we hold to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. Haines -vs.- Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (Reversed & Remanded), and Woods -vs- Carey, 525 F3d 886, 889-890 (Reversed & Remanded), and claims Pro Per, in his own person, a rule in pleading that pleas to the jurisdiction of the Court must be pleaded in propria persona, see Kay -vs.- Ehrler, 499 U.S. 432. "...The requirement of standing, however, has a core component derived directly from the Constitution. A plaintiff must allege personal injury fairly traceable to defendant's allegedly unlawful conduct and likely to be redressed by the requested relief." Allen v. Wright, 468 U.S. 737 (1984).
- 5) If at any time in the past Antonio Luis Freire inadvertently waived his rights, surrendered his rights or in any way lessened his status through contract, it would be a nullity as such would have been done without full disclosure, clean hands, good faith, and fair business practices furthermore it would be unconscionable. Let's be clear, no man or woman would knowingly sign away their rights.
- 6) Express Reservation of Rights: On and for the record, on the face of the court record, Antonio Luis Freire hereby expressly reserves all rights under Nevada and International Law, specifically, Nevada Revised Statutes 104.1308 the Uniform Commercial Code 1-308 as well as international treaties and other Common Law and Superior Court decisions.
- 7) This is a self-executing contract. Notice to the principal is notice to the agent, notice to the agent is notice to the principal. You are hereby bound to inform all of your superiors and

- 12) It has been decided that when a state officer acts under a state law in a manner violative of the Federal Constitution, he comes into conflict with the superior authority of that Constitution, and he is in that case stripped of his official or representative character and is subjected in his person to the consequences of his individual conduct. The State has no power to impart to him any immunity from responsibility to the supreme authority of the United States.
- 13) Agents of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (hereinafter known as LVMPD) along with agents of the Office of the District Attorney (hereinafter known as the ODA) have repeatedly violated their oaths of office, employment contracts and a lawfully binding contract which was established between these parties and myself in 2013, thus depriving me of clearly established constitution protections. The contract between my person and agents of the LVMPD and ODA was established with clean hands, in good faith, with fair business practices and done with full disclosure. Their agencies owe me millions of dollars in compensation for breach of this contract, in accordance with my fee schedule, or further injuries may result. I will prove this contract is legally and lawfully binding at my earliest possible opportunity, in an open court of law. I have a claim for which relief may be granted against the ODA and LVMPD.
- 14) Judges from the Regional Justice Center (hereinafter known as the RJC) have on multiple occasions acted in a manner depriving me of clearly established constitution protections.
 - a. Specifically, Justice of the Peace Janiece S. Marshall (hereinafter known as Janiece Marshall) during her adjudication of citation number 05097341 and booking number 13000019781 not only violated her oath of office and employment contract, which injured me and my person, but also, as will be proven, acted upon her individual capacity. She was given legal notice 3 (THREE) different times, of as many as 11 (ELEVEN) that she committed violations of her oath of office and/ or employment contract, in an open court of law, in front of multiple witnesses and on audio/video violations.
 - b. Then Janice Marshall levied war against me, one of the People when she took it upon her individual capacity to have me assaulted and kidnapped and held for ransom, when in truth all I did was exercise my rights. This injured me and my person and left me as an aggrieved party.
 - i. I gave similar notice to Judge James Bixler and he was fair. He took the notices and accepted them as truth and did not retaliate against me.
 - ii. That is why I seek civil and criminal charges against Janiece Marshall on her individual capacity and forgive Judge James Bixler.
 - c. Judge Behr and Judge Ronald J. Israel both denied me truth in evidence amongst other violations of their oath of office and employment contracts. This injured me and my person and left me as an aggrieved party.
 - d. Judge Merle K. Lok owes allegiance to the United States. She levied war against me, one of the People, when she took it upon her individual capacity during her adjudication of Family Court Case R-09-151477-R in November of 2016, and not only violated her oath of office and employment contract, which injured me and my person but has denied me my right to my child. It is a fact of those court preceding's that I never signed my child Ashley Marie Ferrari's birth certificate, depriving the court of jurisdiction. When I made such claim in an open court of law, in front of 2 witnesses, (Bailiff and another inmate) she levied war against me

and my person by ordering me held for ransom. The state had no claim against me and this judge should have recognized that fact in law or taken the time necessary to prove or disprove that in a court of law. This injured me and my person and left me as an aggrieved party.

- 15) Agents of the Clark County Detention Center (hereinafter known as CCDC) have held me against my will, levied war against me, one of the People when their agents took it upon their individual capacity to use military tactics against me, a non-combatant. I have frequently asked and demanded a bonafide warrant for my arrest and the accompanying affidavit and have always been denied such, which leads me to believe they may have been committing fraud. In November of 2015 Judge Eric Goodman ordered me released on a Wednesday and agents from CCDC held me against my will until the following Friday. I have a claim for which relief may be granted against CCDC.
- 16) I have been vetted by Judge James Bixler, Janiece Marshall, Judge Eric Goodman and at least one other judge to represent myself. I have studied law for more than 6 years and am fully able to bring this action to a fair and equitable settlement. I have a claim for which relief may be granted. I did not come this far to fail.
- 17) Because I am able to prove each of these agencies have multiple predicate acts over a period of years, the actions of agents of the ODA, RJC, CCDC and LVMPD which have been violative of my rights, prove implicit and/ or explicit R.I.C.O. violations. Any action taken against my person or myself by any agents or agencies involved in this action, shall be deemed as retaliation and sanctions may be brought against such agents on their individual and official capacity.
- 18) I reserve the right to bring civil and or criminal charges against additional agents of the ODA, RJC, CCDC and or LVMPD if any of their agents continue retaliating against me or my person.

ANTONIO LUIS FREIRE, ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

State of Nevada
County of Clark

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me, this _____ day of May, 2017,

By ______

Notary Public

My commission expires:

19) Further affiant sayeth not.

subordinates involved in this matter. If there is something you do not understand clearly, it is incumbent upon you to summon a superior officer, special prosecutor, federal judge or other competent legal counsel to immediately explain the significance of this instrument as per your duties and obligations in respect to this private formal instrument. You have 3, three days from the receipt of this NOTICE to respond on a point by point basis, via sworn Affidavit, under full commercial liability, signing under penalty of perjury that the facts contained therein are true, correct, complete and not misleading. Mere declarations are an insufficient response and a complete nullity. If an extension of time is needed to properly answer, please request such in writing. Failure to respond will be deemed Nihil Dicit Tacit Acquiescence and constitutes agreement with the facts stated within the attached AFFIDAVIT and as an acceptance of liability. Traitors, Protestants, Liberals and Heretics take heed for I oppose your causes for I am a dignitary to assist the injured off of the battlefield. I am a non-combatant and a man of peace. I am one of the protected People and all agents of government are hereby assigned the title of fiduciary to me as such it is your and their duty to protect me as a high priority. I am a man of good will.

- 8) I have a claim for which relief may be granted. Of all the parties involved in this action, I am the only one who has made that statement under oath and therefore all attempts to dismiss on those grounds shall be denied. The Federal and State constitutions both allow redress of the government without time limitations. I demand remedy. It is Federal Law that every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress, except that in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer's judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable. For the purposes of this section, any Act of Congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a statute of the District of Columbia.
- 9) Since public officials are required to swear an oath to uphold the Constitution (as per Article VI, Clause 3), for these same officials to ignore the Court's precedents is equal to a violation of that oath in accordance with Article IV Section 2. Even though education is the responsibility of the state government, that responsibility must be carried out in a manner consistent with the requirements of the Constitution, particularly the Fourteenth Amendment which provides equal protection under the law.
- 10) Any claim of "immunity" which the government agents could possibly make is a fraud, because if valid, it would prevent removal from office for crimes against the people, which removal is authorized or even mandated under the U.S. Constitution Article 2, Section 4, as well as 18 U.S.C. 241, 42 U.S.C. 1983, 1985, 1986 and other state constitutions.
- 11) It has been decided that once a Government Official exceeds his Oath of Office, his employment contract or his jurisdiction, he no longer represents the government. Courts may not step in and either stay or compel executive action unless executive official was acting in excess of his statutory authority or transgressed a constitutional limitation, and the mere fact that he might be acting erroneously or perhaps even tortuously does not vest courts with jurisdiction to act.